DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 178 EC 309 771

AUTHOR	Munoz, Marco A.; Dossett, Dena; Judy-Gullans, Katalina
TITLE	Educating Students Placed at Risk: Evaluating the Impact of Success for All in Urban Settings.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	38p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Reading; *Educational Change; *Educational Environment; Elementary Education; *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Instructional Effectiveness; Parent Attitudes; Parent Participation; Prevention; *Program Effectiveness; *Reading Difficulties; Reading Instruction; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS	*Success for All Program

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the effect of the Success for All school reform model on the standardized reading scores, attendance, and disciplinary needs of 217 students in three elementary schools using the program and 132 similar students in three other urban schools. The schools were also compared using teacher, student, and parent perception data on school climate scales. The Success for All program is intended to ensure that every child learns to read in the early grades and groups students according to reading level for one 90-minute reading period per day. The model also incorporates a Family Support Team to encourage parental involvement in the school. School level comparison showed the model had a positive effect on achievement test scores and attendance. At the student level, results showed a reading effect, especially in basic reading skills. Teachers, students and parents at program schools showed more positive perceptions of school climate, educational quality, and job satisfaction than comparison groups. Implications for the accountability and reform movements are discussed. Teacher, student, and parent surveys are appended. (Contains 34 references.) (DB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 480 178

Running head: EDUCATING STUDENTS PLACED AT RISK

Educating Students Placed At Risk: Evaluating the Impact of Success for All in Urban Settings

Marco A. Munoz

Dena Dossett

Katalina Judy-Gullans

Jefferson County Public Schools

Direct correspondence to:

Marco A. Munoz

Jefferson County Public Schools

Accountability, Research, and Planning Department

3332 Newburg Road

Louisville, KY 40218

Phone: (502) 485-6348

Fax: (502) 485-6255

E-mail: mmunoz2@jefferson.k12.ky.us

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 309771

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Munoz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

Abstract

Schools across the nation are implementing models that will enable all children to meet state-established academic standards. One of the nation's comprehensive school reform models is Success for All. This study assessed the impact of the program on elementary school students (n = 217) in standardized reading scores as well as attendance and disciplinary measures when compared to control students (n = 132). Program (n = 3) and control schools (n = 3) were also compared using teacher, student, and parent perception data on school climate scales. Significant effects were not seen on every measure, but the consistent direction and magnitude of the effects showed benefits for SFA students when compared to control students. Implications for educational policy and practice are discussed.

Keywords: Elementary School Students; High Risk Students; Academic Achievement; Early Intervention; Reading Achievement; School Restructuring; Urban Schools.

Educating Students Placed At Risk: Evaluating the Impact of Success for All in Urban Settings

Over the last two decades, numerous national studies and reports have documented both the struggles and failings of public education. Educators, policy-makers, and researchers alike concluded that a large number of schools, particularly in high poverty urban centers, were ineffective at meeting the needs of diverse student populations (Cooper, 1998). In an effort to assist schools in making curriculum changes, aid in instructional delivery, and strengthen the organizational structure of the schools, an abundance of school-wide reform models have emerged. If educators have learned anything about school reform, it is that a piecemealed approach to changing poor classroom practice is a losing battle. A collection of isolated programs does not add up to school-wide improvement (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2001).

The comprehensive approach to school-wide improvement is not new. A line of inquiry referred to as effective school research were forerunners in taking a comprehensive approach to school improvement. These studies attempted to identify the characteristics of schools that make them instructionally effective for disadvantage students (Brookover, Beady, Flook, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979; Clark, Lotto, & McCarthy, 1980; Edmonds, 1979; Weber, 1971).

One of the nation's comprehensive school reform models is Success For All (SFA). SFA is designed for elementary schools (PreK-6) to ensure that every

child learns to read in the early grade levels (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, Smith, & Dianda, 1996). The primary goal of SFA is to prevent reading problems in the first place and to intervene swiftly and intensively if problems do appear (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2001). According to Madden and Slavin (1999), the first goal of reform should be to ensure that every child, regardless of home background, home language, or learning style, achieves the success that he or she so confidently expected in kindergarten.

In the SFA program organizational structure, students are grouped according to reading-level for one 90-minute reading period per day while the rest of the day they are assigned to regular age-grouped grades. At eight-week intervals, teachers evaluate the performance reading level of students to (a) determine who requires reading tutors, (b) reassign reading groups, (c) suggest other adaptations in students' programs, and (d) identify students who need other types of assistance (e.g., screening for vision and hearing problems). The model also incorporates a Family Support Team (FST), to encourage parental contribution and involvement in the school. The FST is designed to help increase parental involvement. SFA schools have a Program Facilitator who is responsible for assisting teachers on the implementation of the curriculum and classroom management. Teachers receive three days of in-service training at the beginning of the school year. Throughout the year the program facilitator and technical

support staff provide professional development on topics such as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning.

Established in 1987 by Robert Slavin and colleagues from Johns Hopkins University, SFA has been implemented in about 15,000 schools in 48 states throughout the nation. It is considered one of the most successful and extensively researched whole-school change models (Borman & Hewes, 2001; Cooper, 1998; Cooper, Madden, & Slavin, 1997; Madden & Slavin, 1999). Developers and third-party research work has been done in Memphis, Tennessee (Ross, Sanders, & Wright, 1998), Fort Wayne, Indiana (Ross, Smith, & Casey, 1997), Flint, Michigan (Madden & Slavin, 1999), and Baltimore, Maryland (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, & Smith, 1994).

Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan and Wasik (1993) investigated the longitudinal effects of SFA on inner-city elementary schools in Baltimore. The purpose was to identify outcomes of student reading achievement and other outcomes in elementary schools serving large number of disadvantaged students. A total of five SFA schools were studied over a three-year period with comparisons with matched students in matched schools. Control schools were matched on percentage of students receiving free lunch, historical achievement level, and other factors. Within each matched school, students were individually matched on standardized achievement test scores from the spring before SFA implementation. The reading test data were analyzed using multivariate analyses

of variance (MANCOVA), with pretest data as covariates and scores on the reading scales as dependent measures. Univariate analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were also computed for each dependent measure. Additionally, separate analysis was conducted for students who scored in the lowest 25% of their cohorts on the pretests. The results found strong positive effects on administered reading measures in most schools for students who have been in the program since the first grade.

Ross et al (1994) conducted an investigation to assess the impact of SFA on students at risk of failing to learn to read. The student examined the effects of SFA program in four cities: (a) Memphis, Tennessee; (b) Montgomery, Alabama; (c) Fort Wayne, Indiana; (d) Caldwell, Idaho. Specifically the study sought to assess student achievement when the SFA program was introduced in setting geographically removed from program developers. A comparison of individual reading test results with those of matched control groups indicated advantages at three of the sites. Of particular interest was the assessment of the lowest achieving sample. Advantages were detected for the lowest achieving 25 percent of students relative to their control counterparts at all four sites. Results also indicated that the SFA program could be replicated at distant locations and with limited monitoring by program developers. The systematic procedures of the program facilitated the replication process.

Ross and colleagues (1997) examined the impact of SFA in school performance across three grades on both individually and state-mandated standardized reading tests. The study used program and matched-control students. Findings indicated more positive effects for SFA students, some decline in effects over time, and greater effects for minority than for non-minority students. The same year, Jones, Gottfredson, and Gottfredson conducted another similar evaluation to assess the impact of the SFA program in early grades elementary schools. The researchers also used a control group methodology. The SFA program was implemented for three years and under difficult circumstances. The findings of the comparison of the SFA program and control group were mixed results. Findings for 113 SFA students and 59 comparison students showed positive effects for the kindergarten component but largely negative effects in grades two and three. The researchers recommended that future evaluations should assess the impact of the program when SFA students reach the third grade level.

More recently, Borman and Hewes (2001) conducted an investigation on the long-term outcomes of SFA. Sustained effects on student achievement was proposed and investigated through treatment ($\underline{n}$ = 1310) and control ($\underline{n}$ = 1730) student secondary data of the Baltimore City Public School System. The treatment students included all students from the original SFA elementary schools and the control students were matched on demographic characteristics and the amount of

funding their school received. Three dependent variables were of primary interest: (a) achievement, (b) grade-level progression (or retention), and (c) special education placements. The investigators utilized an ANCOVA, controlling for pretest score. Findings indicated that there were statistically significant differences between SFA and control students. When controlling for kindergarten pretest differences, SFA students had higher eighth grade CTBS/4 reading and math scale scores, in comparison to control students. The findings showed statistically significant differences between SFA and control students with SFA students spending fewer years enrolled in special education and a lower number of retentions.

To date, little SFA research has been conducted in Kentucky, a state characterized for its innovative educational reform environment. In 1990, the Kentucky General Assembly passed the Kentucky Educational Reform Act (KERA) that mandated a complete restructuring of the public elementary and secondary system in the areas of finance, governance, curriculum, and assessment. The school district in Kentucky that served as research site for this study has more than 93,000 students in grades K-12 and approximately 150 school sites. The district differs from other school systems since it has a student assignment plan based on managed choice that produces racial disaggregation of its schools by providing transportation of students from their home neighborhoods to other parts of the district.

This third-party investigation contributes to extant research on SFA by using a mixed method approach for a large number of school-related variables. The study's primary objective was determining the impact of the program on school, student, teacher, and parent variables after three years of implementation. The following overarching research questions guided the study: Does SFA impact students' reading achievement? Does SFA result in improved student attendance? Does the model result in a decrease in discipline problems? Finally, what affects does SFA have on teacher, student, and parent perceptions of school climate, educational quality and job satisfaction in their schools?

Since SFA is primarily a reading program implemented during the school hours, the analysis of the impact of the program in reading scores was an essential component of the study. Supplementary variables such as attendance, suspensions, and school climate were assessed to gain understanding on the systemic nature of change that SFA creates when implemented in public schools. SFA is a program that is comprehensive in nature (e.g., curriculum, assessment, individualized assistance, family support). In this regard, the framework of biosocial developmental contextualism (Ramey & Ramey, 1998) provided a rationale for assessing the aforementioned accompanying variables.

Method

Participants

The sample included three treatment elementary schools and three matched control schools. The three schools became involved with SFA as part of their effort to increase student achievement and had been implementing SFA for three years. Previous research methodology served as the basis for developing the matching procedure (Borman & Hewes, 2001; Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1993; Ross et al, 1997). Schools were matched on demographic characteristics of their students from data collected in the baseline year (1999-2000). Table 1 illustrates the key characteristics in which the treatment and control schools were matched, the aggregated data for both treatment and control schools, and the district average. The variables included are poverty, mobility, attendance, Exceptional Child Education (ECE), single parent household, and the CTBS reading scores. The urban district that served as research site is characterized by the high poverty level of its student population. Table 1 showed that the treatment and control schools had an even higher percentage of students on poverty when compared to the district average of free/reduced lunch participants.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Table 2 summarizes the baseline data for the student level samples. As it can be observed the treatment and control group were similar in demographic

variables. The previous test scores were found dissimilar and a statistical adjustment was deemed necessary to control for initial differences.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Instrumentation

All data, from 1997-1998 (baseline year) to 2000-2001 school years, were abstracted from computerized files provided by the school district that served as the research site. Data from the state assessment system (i.e., CTBS) and from the school district (reading diagnostic test) were utilized. The primary dependent variable used in this study was the CTBS Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores in reading (Kramer, Conoley, & Murphy, 1992). NCE scores ranges from 1 to 99 with an average of 50; these scores compare to the students performance to a national norm group. The CTBS is a standardized achievement test that was group-administered at the end of the school year. The CTBS includes reading, language arts, and mathematics sub-tests. The questions are multiple-choice. The level 13 tests are given to the elementary school third graders and have 30 items in reading. Since SFA is a reading curriculum based on research and effective practices (Madden & Slavin, 1999), only the reading indices were abstracted. Non-cognitive indicators such as attendance and suspensions were also utilized as dependent variables.

The fundamental independent variable was membership to treatment and control groups, using the Stanford Reading Diagnostic Test (SDRT) as the key

covariate. The SDRT (Kramer, Conoley, & Murphy, 1992) is standardized, diagnostic test that was administered to second grade students during the first few weeks of the school year. .

In an attempt to capture teacher (Appendix A), student (Appendix B), and parent (Appendix C) perceptions, data were collected from the district-wide comprehensive surveys. The surveys contained different subscales, such as school climate and educational quality with Likert-type response scales ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree (see Appendix A, B, and C for scales and items). Teachers were also asked about their job satisfaction.

The results of the reliability analysis conducted on the subscales of the teacher, student and parent survey for both the baseline and after three years are displayed in Table 3. The reliability analysis yielded alpha coefficients well beyond the minimum acceptable level of .60 (Nunnally, 1994) in all the scales of the various surveys.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Design and Procedures

A mixed method design involving qualitative and quantitative research proved useful to understand the SFA program in the large urban district that served as research site for this study. Few studies have involved the analysis of the SFA program from the perspective of multiple stakeholders (i.e., teachers, parents, students). Greene and McClintock (1985) argue that mixed designs can

be used for the distinct purpose of complementarity. The concept is to enhance and clarify the results from one method with the results from the other method. The mixed design was illustrated in this study by the use of a questionnaire about school climate and educational quality perceptions of students, teachers, and parents combined with more quantitative-oriented measures (e.g., standardized test scores, attendance, suspensions). In this study, the analyses were conducted separately and integration occurred during interpretation and reporting. Furthermore, since results convergence was hypothesized, perception data were brought in to support quantitative findings.

Quantitative Data Analyses. The impact evaluation design employed a matched pre-posttest design with control group (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Cook & Campbell, 1979; Kirk, 1990; Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 1999). The data at the school level for both treatment and control schools were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Due to the inability to randomly assign individuals to treatment and control groups, a two-level matching procedure was used to add rigor in terms of the internal validity of the study (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Cook & Campbell, 1979). The first level of matching was at the school level and it involved checking similarity in terms of poverty (operationalized as participation on the free/reduced lunch program), race, single parent households, gender, and SDRT scores. These schools, in turn, served as the basis for the second level of matching which took place at the student level. Treatment and

control students were matched on four demographic variables, namely free/reduced lunch, race, single parent households, and gender. Given the categorical nature of the variables, the matching procedure was checked using chi-squares. No statistically significant differences were found and this confirmed that the matching procedure was successful to avoid the need of using statistical controls (i.e., covariates) beyond previous test scores.

The data were first examined to test the statistical assumptions (e.g., distributional assumptions of the outcomes, homogeneity of variance, examination of outliers) of the desired analysis procedure (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). Since the data were found to be amenable to the General Linear Modeling (GLM), the data at the student level was analyzed using a comparison design that involved the use of the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) having the treatment condition as the between-subject factor and the pre-test scores as the covariate. The ANCOVA (Kirk, 1990) allows for the comparison of group means on a dependent variable after the group means have been adjusted on a relevant covariate variable. In addition, each mean difference between SFA and control students was divided, or standardized, by the pooled posttest standard deviation for the outcome (Hedges & Olkin, 1985, p. 79). The resulting standardized differences, or effect sizes, provide summaries of the magnitude of each effect and are interpretable as the number of standard deviation units separating SFA from control students on the outcomes.

Qualitative Data Analyses. The comprehensive survey instruments are administered yearly using scantron forms at the beginning of the school year. The teacher, student and parent surveys are distributed to all schools in October and schools are given approximately four weeks to complete and return the surveys to the district's research department. Students are given the parents surveys to take home with them and return to school. Schools are asked to create a process that maintains confidentiality for staff forms.

The response rates for the baseline and after three treatment years varied among teachers, students, and parents. For the teacher survey was 63.9% for controls and 73.7% for the treatment schools for the baseline and treatment school years, respectively. The response rate for the student survey was 67.3% for the controls and 69.6% for the treatment schools. The response rate for the parent survey was 40.8% for the controls and 42.9% for the treatment schools. The response rates for the teacher and student surveys were considered "good" (Babbie, 1989) while the parent response rate was less than optimal.

Results

Research Question 1: Does SFA affect the overall student achievement as measured on standardized reading test scores?

Table 4 identifies the CTBS reading scores for both the treatment and control schools from 1997-2001. The aggregated treatment school data shows a continuous increase in CTBS reading scores from the baseline year to the third

year of SFA implementation (4.4 point gain); in contrast, the aggregated control schools data shows a gain of only 2.3 points. Two out of three treatment schools showed an increase on the CTBS scores during the first year of implementation of the model (98-99 to 99-00). Only one treatment school showed gains in the in the second year. Two out of three treatment schools showed gains in year 3.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

The ANCOVA test was used to analyze the student level sample (N = 349) and indicated that, after adjustment by the covariate, the effect of the program remained significant ($F[1, 348] = 4.71, p < .05, ES = .11$). SFA students ($M = 46.4, SD = 1.2$) had higher adjusted mean scores than the control group ($M = 43.3, SD = 0.9$) on CTBS reading scores.

Research Question 2: Does SFA result in improved school student attendance?

Table 5 identifies the school level attendance for the treatment and control schools. At the school level, the aggregated treatment and control school data shows similar trends in attendance. Overall, both treatment and control schools made gains in the three years of SFA since the baseline year (1.2 gain and .7 gain, respectively). SFA schools doubled the gains of the control schools.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Research Question 3: Does the model result in a decrease of discipline problems?

From the baseline year to the third year of SFA implementation, the aggregated treatment schools more than doubled the decrease in number of out-

of-school suspensions when compared to the control schools (7 and 3, respectively). Despite the decline, the treatment schools averaged a higher number of suspensions. A major increase in suspensions was observed during the first year of SFA implementation, particularly in one of the schools. The suspension incidences remained higher for the program schools in the second year of SFA. The third year of SFA showed a remarkable decrease in number of suspensions at the treatment schools. Table 6 displays the discipline data.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

Research Question 4: What affects does SFA have on teacher, student, and parent perceptions as measured on the comprehensive survey?

Teachers in the treatment schools gave higher ratings in the areas of school climate, educational quality and job satisfaction after three years of SFA implementation when compared to the baseline measures (see Table 7). Teachers in the SFA schools showed larger improvements in their perceptions of school climate, educational quality and job satisfaction than teachers in the control schools. Two of the control schools showed decreases in teachers' perceptions of school climate and educational quality.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

Students in the treatment schools demonstrated higher ratings of school climate and educational quality after SFA implementation than at baseline (see Table 8). Again, the results were positive, since the average ratings were above 4

on a 5-point scale. While students in the control schools gave higher ratings in school climate and educational quality during the 2001-2002 school year than students in the treatment schools, students in the SFA schools showed larger improvements in their perceptions in both areas from the baseline year.

[Insert Table 8 about here]

Parents whose children attended in the treatment schools demonstrated higher ratings of school climate and educational quality after SFA implementation than at baseline (see Table 9). Parents in the treatment schools gave the same ratings in school climate and educational quality during the 2001-2002 school year as parents whose children attended the control schools. However, parents in the SFA schools showed larger improvements in their perceptions of school climate.

[Insert Table 9 about here]

In summary, the perceptions of all three key stakeholder groups, teachers, students and parents, showed improvements in the areas of school climate and educational quality from the baseline year to the after three-year treatment school year. In general, the improvements were larger than those of the control schools.

Discussion

In an effort to assist schools in making instructional and organizational changes, an abundance of school-wide reform models have emerged. With more than a decade of research documenting its impact on public education, SFA is

considered a tool for urban school reform. The concept of SFA is to restructure elementary schools to ensure that every child learns to read in the early grades. The idea is to prevent reading problems from appearing in the first place and to intervene speedily and intensively when problems do appear.

Previous third-party evaluations (Ross, Nunnery, & Smith, 1996; Ross, Sanders, & Wright, 1998) of SFA schools in districts across the nation have shown that the program increased student reading performance and other school related measures. Some SFA research has been criticized in the past. For instance, Pogrow (1999) argues that sources of bias are the use of tests that the SFA curriculum may be geared to and that control schools do no align with; the fact that the vendor selects the test; school sampling bias; student sampling criteria; and, the fact that SFA relies primarily on individually administered tests, while students are tested in the real world with group administered tests. This study addressed those sources of bias by using valid and reliable, group-administered tests, namely the CTBS (i.e., achievement test) and SDRT (i.e., diagnostic test).

This evaluation of the SFA program was conducted at both school and student level. The school-level showed that the model has a positive effect on CTBS scores and attendance, but it varied across schools. The treatment schools that have properly implemented SFA have continuously increased their CTBS scores in comparison to the control schools. In terms of attendance, the gains are also higher for the treatment schools when compared to the control schools. In

terms of suspensions, a notable decrease was experienced in the treatment schools when compared to the control schools. At the student level, the results showed a reading effect in the SFA students when compared to the control students. The connection between SFA and CTBS lies in the basic skills that are tested in CTBS and the skills taught in the SFA curriculum. Teachers, students and parents at SFA schools showed larger improvements in their perceptions of school climate, educational quality, and job satisfaction when compared to those of the control schools.

These findings agree with the recent research findings of other third-party meta-evaluators. Herman, Aladjem, McMahon, Masem, Mulligan, O'Malley, Quinones, Reeve, and Woodruff (1999) conducted a study that evaluated the research base underlying the most widely used school wide programs. Herman and colleagues concluded that SFA is one of three programs with strong research support of effectiveness. More recently, a meta-analysis conducted by Borman, Hewes, Overman, and Brown (2002) found that SFA is one of the three models meeting the highest standard of evidence on improving student test scores across varying contexts and study designs.

The framework of biosocial developmental contextualism (Ramey & Ramey, 1998) provides an avenue for understanding the program benefits (Borman & Hewes, 2001). The framework highlights issues such as (a) developmental timing; (b) program intensity; (c) direct provision of learning

experiences; (d) program breadth and flexibility; (e) individual differences in program benefits; and, (f) environmental maintenance of development.

The overall positive outcomes might be associated to multiple factors. SFA is a highly scripted program supported by on-site facilitators that provide on-going professional development. SFA emphasizes attention to the critical first grade of elementary school (Wasik & Slavin, 1993): certified teacher tutors (not teacher aides) work intensively with early-identified academically at-risk students and provide direct learning experiences. The program is comprehensive in nature and includes continuous assessment, individualized assistance, and family support. SFA produced these types of school outcomes partially because of the quality implementation, strong external technical assistance and district-level support. Principals of the SFA schools are ensuring the uninterrupted 90-minute block and monitoring the implementation at the classroom level. Teachers have voted to implement the program to ensure their empowerment.

Although clearly encouraging, the findings of this mixed method study are limited in many important ways. This study was not conducted as a randomized, controlled trial, which limits the ability to reach firm causal conclusions about intervention effectiveness. Due to the strong matching procedure and statistical controls, the study still has strong internal validity and differential group change may be attributed more to the interventions than to potentially confounding intervening factors (Cook and Campbell, 1979). The perception data associated

with parents, due to the low response rate, should not be generalized to other settings.

Regardless of the strong matching procedure, future third-party researchers need to address the impact of the program on higher-order skills assessed using open-ended questions. This is important in light of the value the open-ended responses get in the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System used in Kentucky. KERA, one of the nation's most comprehensive and longest-running statewide school-reform, places high weight to the criterion-referenced test used to specifically assess the educational standards delineated in the Kentucky Academic Expectations and the Core Content for Assessment (Pankratz & Petrosko, 2000). In addition, given the dynamic school characteristics and internal factors affecting model implementation, further analysis using qualitative methods might clarify factors related to implementation quality, including principal support and buy-in on the part of teachers.

The impact of SFA is important in light of the accountability and reform movement in the schools, especially in a state like Kentucky. The function of an accountability system in education is to monitor and evaluate the performance of the education system as a whole and the individual school's achievement (Wohlstetter, 1991). Outcome-based education focuses on defining specified educational results. Across the nation the clamor is to raise results for all our children, regardless of their socio-economic conditions.

References

Babbie, E. (1989). *The Practice of Social Research.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Borman, G.D., Hewes, G.M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2002). *Comprehensive school reform and student achievement: A meta-analysis.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Borman, G.D., & Hewes, G.M. (2001). *The Long-Term Effects and Cost-Effectiveness of Success for All.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flook, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference.* New York: Praeger.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research,* Palo Alto, CA: Houghton Mifflin .

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & McCarthy, M. M. (1980). Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 469-470.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cooper, R. (1998). *Socio-Cultural and Within-School Factors That Affect the Quality of Implementation of School-Wide Programs*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Cooper, R., Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1997). *Success for All. Exploring the Technical, Normative, Political, and Socio-Cultural Dimensions of Scaling-Up*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective Schools for the Urban Poor. *Educational Leadership 37(1)*, 15-24.

Greene, J. G., & McClintock, C. (1985). Triangulation in evaluation: Design and analysis issues. *Evaluation Research, 9,* 523-547.

Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. New York: Academic Press.

Herman, R., Aladjem, D., McMahon, P., Masem, E., Mulligan, I., O'Malley, A. S., Quinones, S., Reeve, A., & Woodruff, D. (1999). *An educators' guide to schoolwide reform.* Washington, DC: American Institute for Research.

Jones, E. M., Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (1997). Success for some: An evaluation of a Success for All program. *Evaluation Review (21) 6,* 643-670.

Kirk, R. E. (1990). *Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral science* (3rd ed.). New York: Brooks & Cole Publishing.

Kramer, J. J., Conoley, J. C., & Murphy, L. L. (1992). *The eleventh mental measurements yearbook.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1999). *Success for All/Roots & Wings. Summary of Research on Achievement Outcomes.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweith, N.L., Dolan, L.J., & Wasik, B.A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 30,* 123-148.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (2001). Catalog of School Reform Models. Available FTP: http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/catalog/index.shtml

Nunnally, J. C. (1994). *Psychometric theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pankratz, R. S., & Petrosko, J. M. (2000). *All children can learn: Lesson from the Kentucky Reform Experience.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pogrow, S. (1999, November). Consistent large gains and high levels of achievement are the best measures of program quality: Pogrow responds to Slavin. *Educational Researcher, 28 (8),* 24-31.

Ramey, C.T., & Ramey, S.L. (1998). Early intervention and early experience. *American Psychologist, 53,* 109-120.

Ross, S. M. et al (1994). *Using Success for All to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American

Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 456)

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Casey, J. P. (1997). Preventing early school failure: Impacts of Success for All on standardized test outcomes, minority group performance, and school effectiveness. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (2), 1,* 29-53.

Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J., & Smith, L. J. (1996). *Evaluation of Title I reading programs*. Memphis: University of Memphis Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S.M., Sanders, W.L., & Wright, S.P. (1998). *An analysis of Tennessee Value Added Assessment (TVAAS) performance outcomes of Roots and Wings schools from 1995-1997.* Memphis: University of Memphis.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Lipsey, M. W. (1999). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (6th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S., Smith, L., & Dianda, M. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 1(1),* 41-76.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S., & Smith, L. (1994). "Whenever and Wherever we choose...:" The replication of Success for All. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75,* 639-647.

Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Wasik, B. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-on-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28,* 178-200.

Weber, G. (1971). *Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.

Wohlstetter, P. (1991). Accountability mechanisms for state education reform: Some organizational alternatives. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13,* 31-48.

Appendix A: Teacher Survey

School Climate

1. Our school recognizes student's outstanding contributions or performance.
2. All students in our school are capable of learning.
3. Our staff actively supports the school's Consolidated Plan.
4. My principal and other building administrators are supportive of my efforts to educate students.
5. My school building is clean and well maintained.
6. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of communications within the district.
7. Parents of my students invest time or resources in our school's program.
8. Students in my school are disciplined fairly and effectively.
9. My school administration does a good job of managing this school.
10. Parents, students, and staff all work together to improve the school.
11. Resources at my school are distributed fairly.
12. My school's staff and faculty work together effectively.
13. Faculty and staff at my school set high expectations for the achievement and social development of each student.
14. My students are motivated to learn.
15. Students are proud to attend my school.
16. Most of our students obey the rules established by the faculty and staff.
17. Faculty and staff have high expectations for one another
18. A positive atmosphere for learning exists at my school.
19. Faculty and staff at my school really care about students as persons.
20. I am proud of my school.
21. I feel confident using technology in my classroom.
22. I am able to provide a variety of learning environments to meet the needs of different learners.
23. Our school is effectively implementing a plan to close the achievement gap.

Educational Quality

1. A strong academic program is offered to students at my school.
2. Curriculum offerings in our school meet the needs of most students.
3. Weekly, my students receive feedback regarding their academic performance.
4. Our school has implemented an effective Extended School Services Program that meets student needs.
5. My school's library/Media Center is well equipped to meet student needs.
6. School-Based Decision-Making has helped improve my school's quality of education.
7. The quality of education the district provides continues to improve.

8. I recommend to parents district's schools over private and parochial schools.
9. I would rather send my own children to the district's schools than to private/parochial schools.
10. Our faculty and staff share a commitment to the excellence of the school.
11. I am satisfied that my school's curriculum ensures mastery-level reading skills.
12. I am satisfied that my school's curriculum ensures mastery-level writing skills.
13. I am satisfied that my school's curriculum ensures mastery-level math skills.
14. I believe Early Childhood programs in the district have facilitated improved achievement in our primary students.
15. Our school's curriculum adequately addresses the need to prepare students for using technology.
16. I believe our school has fully integrated the curriculum.

Job Satisfaction

1. I am very satisfied with my current position.
2. I would likely recommend the district as a good place to work.
3. Overall, I like the work that I am doing.
4. I would rate my contribution to the success of my school as excellent.
5. My job gives me adequate opportunities for personal and professional development.
6. I receive adequate training to perform my job well.
7. My principal gives me adequate feedback on my job performance.

Appendix B: Student Survey

School Climate

1. My principal does a good job.
2. The rules at my school are fair to students.
3. Most students obey school rules.
4. Most students show the proper respect for adults in my school.
5. I follow the school rules.
6. My parent(s)/guardian(s) encourages me to do my best.
7. My parent(s)/guardian(s) helps me with my homework.
8. The students in my school are nice to one another.
9. The adults in my school treat students fairly.
10. My school is clean.
11. I am proud of my school.
12. The adults in my school are friendly and helpful.
13. The adults in my school make sure students follow the rules.
14. My teacher(s) really care about me.

Quality of Education

1. The work I do at school helps me learn.
2. I think I am learning as much as I should.
3. I enjoy using the library or Media Center when I do my work.
4. I am happy attending this school.
5. The work I do in my classes is interesting to me.
6. The work we do in school will help me get a good job when I grow up.
7. I get to use technology (computers, VCRs, etc.) in my classes.
8. My teacher(s) does a good job.
9. My teacher(s) gives me help when I need it.
10. My teacher(s) let my parents/guardians know what I am learning in school.
11. I know what my teacher(s) expects me to do in class.
12. My teacher(s) expect me to learn a great deal.
13. My teacher(s) let me know how I am doing with my classes every week.
14. The work I do at school makes me a better reader.
15. The work I do at school makes me a better math student.
16. The work I do at school makes me a better writer.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C: Parent Survey

School Climate

1. Administrators at my child's school treat my child fairly.
2. I believe administrators do a good job of maintaining discipline.
3. The principal makes time to see me when I have concerns.
4. My child is given the recognition he/she deserves.
5. I believe my child is encouraged to do his/her best work.
6. I regularly help my child with homework.
7. I am provided adequate information on my child's progress.
8. I am able to resolve problems at my child's school.
9. I believe my child likes school.
10. I believe a positive learning atmosphere exists at my child's school.
11. The school building is clean and comfortable.
12. Teachers at my child's school treat my child fairly.
13. I believe teachers do a good job of maintaining discipline.
14. I feel the teachers care about my child as a person.
15. The teacher(s) makes time to talk with me when I have concerns.
16. The staff is friendly and helpful when I call or visit the school.
17. I have the opportunity to help make decisions on how the school is managed.
18. Our school's Site-Based Decision-Making (SBDM) Council makes decisions that benefit our school.
19. The school's staff and the SBDM demonstrate a commitment to diversity.

Educational Quality

1. The work my child does in school is important.
2. My child is getting a quality education at this school.
3. My child understands what is required in all classes.
4. I believe my child will be prepared to go to the next grade level in school.
5. My child has the opportunity to work on a computer at school.
6. I would rather my child go to this school than any other public school.
7. I would rather my child go to this school than a non-district school.
8. I am proud of my child's school.
9. My child will be able to go to college or get a job after graduation from the district.
10. I am aware that my child must complete a writing portfolio.
11. My child is writing more at home and at school than in previous years.
12. I believe my child's teachers want her/him to be successful.
13. The teaching methods used by teachers are very effective for my child.
14. My child is reading more at home than in past years.
15. My child is doing more mathematics assignments at home than ever before.

Table 1

Treatment and Control Schools Matched at Baseline Year (N = 6)

School	Poverty	Mobility	Percent Attendance	ECE	Single Household	CTBS
School A	86.0	17.89	92.8	8.32	63.5	38.1
Control A	88.8	18.93	94.1	6.73	66.0	38.0
School B	81.1	16.27	94.3	6.27	71.7	38.3
Control B	83.2	10.98	94.3	7.79	60.2	40.4
School C	75.3	15.90	93.3	7.09	66.8	43.0
Control C	73.5	16.93	94.3	5.35	68.8	36.9
Avg. Treatment Schools	80.8	16.69	93.5	7.23	67.3	39.8
Avg. Control Schools	81.8	15.61	94.2	6.62	65.0	38.4
District Avg.	56.0	10.37	95.0	6.62	49.4	48.2

Table 2

Baseline Data for the Student Level Analytical Sample (N = 349)

	Success for All (n = 217)		Control (n = 132)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Reading Pretest	37.00	16.80	35.49	15.64
Female	0.55	0.50	0.55	0.50
Minority	0.54	0.50	0.59	0.49
Free/Reduced Lunch	0.86	0.35	0.83	0.37
Single Parent Home	0.73	0.44	0.72	0.45

Table 3

Reliability Coefficients for Teacher, Student and Parent Comprehensive Surveys

Survey	Number of Respondents		Number of Items	Cronbach Alpha	
	Baseline	Year 3		Baseline	Year 3
Teacher Survey					
School Climate	115	106	25	.93	.94
Educational Quality	115	98	17	.94	.95
Job Satisfaction	115	107	7	.95	.89
Student Survey					
School Climate	667	522	14	.84	.86
Educational Quality	667	547	16	.88	.90
Parent Survey					
School Climate	867	565	19	.94	.95
Educational Quality	867	565	15	.97	.92

Table 4

CTBS Reading NCE Scores for Treatment and Control Schools (N = 6)

School	Baseline Year	SFA Year 1	SFA Year 2	SFA Year 3
School A	30.1	38.1	34.6	35.1
Control A	38.2	38.0	39.4	39.0
School B	40.8	38.3	47.0	51.3
Control B	43.1	40.4	44.2	43.4
School C	40.1	43.0	39.9	37.9
Control C	36.3	36.9	39.4	42.1
Aggregated Treatment	37.0	39.8	40.5	41.4
Aggregated Control	39.2	38.4	41.0	41.5

Table 5

School Attendance Percentages for Treatment and Control Schools (N = 6)

School	Baseline Year	SFA Year 1	SFA Year 2	SFA Year 3
School A	92.8	93.1	93.0	93.9
Control A	94.1	93.6	94.4	94.4
School B	94.3	93.3	95.1	95.6
Control B	94.3	93.3	94.9	95.4
School C	93.3	93.5	93.8	94.7
Control C	94.8	94.8	94.8	95.4
Aggregated Treatment	93.5	93.3	94.0	94.7
Aggregated Control	94.4	93.9	94.7	95.1
District	92.7	93.1	93.4	94.1

Table 6

School Suspension Incidences for Treatment and Control Schools (N = 6)

School	Baseline Year	SFA Year 1	SFA Year 2	SFA Year 3
School A	27	58	27	15
Control A	6	27	10	5
School B	6	1	3	4
Control B	0	1	2	3
School C	16	8	22	7
Control C	16	5	6	3
Aggregated Treatment	16	22	17	9
Aggregated Control	7	11	6	4
District Avg.	2	2	2	2

Table 7

Teacher Perceptions for Treatment and Control Schools (N = 6)

School	School Climate		Educational Quality		Job Satisfaction	
	Baseline M (SD)	Year 3 M (SD)	Baseline M (SD)	Year 3 M (SD)	Baseline M (SD)	Year 3 M (SD)
School A	4.3 (.5)	4.4 (.5)	3.6 (1.2)	4.4 (.6)	3.9 (1.4)	4.6 (.5)
Control A	4.5 (.7)	3.5 (.7)	4.0 (1.4)	3.5 (.7)	5.0 (0.0)	4.5 (.7)
School B	4.1 (.7)	4.3 (.6)	4.2 (.8)	4.3 (.7)	4.5 (.6)	4.4 (.7)
Control B	4.0 (.7)	3.6 (.9)	3.9 (.8)	3.8 (.7)	4.4 (.5)	4.4 (1.1)
School C	3.8 (.9)	4.1 (.7)	3.6 (1.0)	4.0 (.8)	4.0 (.8)	4.6 (.7)
Control C	4.0 (.8)	4.2 (.7)	3.9 (.9)	4.0 (.7)	4.3 (.6)	4.5 (.5)
Aggregated Treatment	*4.1 (.7)*	*4.3 (.6)*	*3.9 (1.0)*	*4.3 (.7)*	*4.1 (1.0)*	*4.5 (.6)*
Aggregated Control	*4.0 (.8)*	*4.0 (.8)*	*3.9 (.9)*	*3.9 (.7)*	*4.4 (.6)*	*4.5 (.7)*

Table 8

Student Perceptions for Treatment and Control Schools (N = 6)

School	School Climate		Educational Quality	
	Baseline M (SD)	Year 3 M (SD)	Baseline M (SD)	Year 3 M (SD)
School A	3.9 (.8)	4.1 (.8)	4.3 (.8)	4.4 (.8)
Control A	4.1 (.8)	4.2 (.5)	4.3 (.9)	4.5 (.5)
School B	4.4 (.6)	4.3 (.7)	4.6 (.6)	4.6 (.6)
Control B	4.3 (.8)	4.2 (.7)	4.5 (.7)	4.5 (.5)
School C	3.8 (.8)	4.3 (.7)	4.1 (.9)	4.4 (.9)
Control C	4.4 (.7)	4.3 (.7)	4.6 (.6)	4.6 (.6)
Aggregated Treatment	*4.1 (.8)*	*4.2 (.7)*	*4.3 (.8)*	*4.5 (.8)*
Aggregated Control	*4.3 (.7)*	*4.3 (.7)*	*4.5 (.7)*	*4.6 (.6)*

Table 9

Parent Perceptions for Treatment and Control Schools (N = 6)

School	School Climate		Educational Quality	
	Baseline M (SD)	Year 3 M (SD)	Baseline M (SD)	Year 3 M (SD)
School A	4.0 (.8)	4.4 (.7)	4.1 (.8)	4.4 (.7)
Control A	4.0 (.6)	4.4 (.7)	3.9 (.6)	4.4 (.6)
School B	3.9 (.7)	4.5 (.6)	4.0 (.7)	4.6 (.6)
Control B	4.2 (.7)	4.4 (.6)	4.2 (.7)	4.3 (.7)
School C	4.1 (.7)	4.4 (.7)	4.2 (.7)	4.4 (.7)
Control C	4.3 (.7)	4.5 (.8)	4.2 (.7)	4.5 (.7)
Aggregated Treatment	*4.0 (.8)*	*4.4 (.7)*	*4.1 (.8)*	*4.4 (.7)*
Aggregated Control	*4.2 (.7)*	*4.4 (.7)*	*4.1 (.7)*	*4.4 (.7)*

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Educating Students Placed At-Risk

Author(s): Marco A. Munoz, Dena Dossett, and Katalina Judy-Gullans

Corporate Source: Jefferson County Public Schools / University of Louisville

Publication Date: April 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Marco Muñoz	Printed Name/Position/Title: Marco A. Munoz, Evaluation Specialist
Organization/Address: 3332 Newburg Rd. Louisville, KY 40218	Telephone: (502) 485-6348 / FAX: (502) 485-6255
	E-Mail Address: mmunoz2@jefferson.k12.ky.us / Date: 4/23/2003

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)